

REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed July 26, 2007, the Examiner indicated that claims 1-20 are pending; objected to claim 14 for informalities; rejected claims 1-3, 15 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ong et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,795,430) in view of Wengrovitz et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2003/0023730); rejected claims 4-13, 16 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ong et al. in view of Wengrovitz et al. and further in view of Strathmeyer et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0118675); rejected claims 18 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ong et al. in view of Wengrovitz et al. and further in view of Lindberg et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,094,479); and rejected claim 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ong et al. in view of Wengrovitz et al. and Strathmeyer et al. as applied to claim 13, and further in view of Lewis et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,947,531). Claims 1-20 are currently pending. The rejections are traversed below.

Claim Objection

Claim 14 is objected to for informalities. The Applicant kindly thanks the Examiner for his suggestion for amending the claim. Claim 14 is amended herein for clarification.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the objection is overcome.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-3, 15 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ong et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,795,430) in view of Wengrovitz et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2003/0023730).

Claim 1 recites "implementing decentralized signaling and payload services through the at least one signaling and payload server by communicating decentralized signaling and payload", "using a gateway for bilateral exchange of the centralized signaling and payload and the decentralized signaling and payload", "and bilaterally converting the communication data between the application interface and the packet-oriented network, the communication data being bilaterally converted with the at least one exchange server" (lines 11-17). The Applicant respectfully submits that the cited art fails to teach these features.

Ong et al. discusses a method and system to provide voice over a network, being directed to "service-related signaling between voice over internet protocol servers" (see title and column 1, lines 8-10). A "SIP gateway 124 provides session initiation to handle session

messages corresponding to voice communication" (column 4, lines 7 and 8, of Ong et al.). Ong et al. further discusses that:

The SIP messages follow a multi-part MIME format that can carry different protocols as part of the body of the message. By defining a MIME type corresponding to QSIG, a QSIG message can be **encapsulated** in a SIP message, so that the SIP message portion is used to control the voice packet characteristics while the QSIG portion (or an encapsulated proprietary portion) is used to access supplementary services logic and control the voice supplementary services.

(Column 3, lines 2-4, of Ong et al., emphasis added). A "call processing unit 128 may be implemented as a subsystem attached to the SIP gateway 124, or as part of the SIP gateway" (column 4, lines 14-17). As such, processing of VOIP calls is handled **outside** of the PBX.

The Office Action states on pages 3 and 4 that Ong et al. "may not have explicitly mentioned an application interface of the central communication device (PBX) bilaterally converting the data between the application interface and the packet-oriented network with at least one exchange server". Ong et al. indeed fails to use an application interface of the PBX since Ong et al. discusses encapsulating QSIG messages used by the PBX. As such, Ong et al. fails to establish a uniform service feature embodiment between VOIP and PBX controlled communication terminals. In fact, since Ong et al. provides a SIP gateway and call processing unit in addition to the PBX, Ong et al. teaches away from providing decentralized packet-oriented and PBX features. As such, the combination of Ong et al. and Wengrovitz et al. is improper here.

Wengrovitz et al. also fails to cure the defects of Ong et al. discussed above. Wengrovitz et al. discusses "a desktop system in which two or more hosts work together to support multimedia sessions via Internet telephony" (paragraph [0002]). Wengrovitz et al. states that:

Preferably, SIP call signaling operations for establishing an SIP multimedia session are conducted by the PC 62 via the SIP signaling stack 76 if the PC is operational. However, if the PC 62 is not operational, the SIP signaling operations are delegated to the emulation client 70 residing in the SIP-enabled PBX 66.

(Paragraph [0045]). In other words, switched and packet-oriented signaling protocols are used in lieu of one another, not in parallel.

Further, Wengrovitz et al. fails to discuss "implementing decentralized signaling and payload services", as recited in claim 1. Wengrovitz et al. discusses that the "SIP-enabled PBX

unit preferably further includes a VoIP conversion stack 68 for converting voice packets received over the IP network 84 into speech according to conventional methods" (paragraph [0044]). However, Wengrovitz et al. is directed to signaling information, not implementing decentralized signaling and payload information as recited in claim 1 (see paragraphs [0044]-[0046]). Wengrovitz et al. thus fails to teach using the application interface of a PBX. As such, a person of ordinary skill in the art would not be compelled to combine Wengrovitz et al. with Ong et al. and the cited art, both individually and in combination, fails to render claim 1 obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Claims 2, 3 and 15 depend from claim 1 and add further features thereto. Thus, the arguments above with respect to claim 1 also apply to these claims.

Claim 20 recites "at least one interface to communicate centralized signaling and payload", "an application interface to exchange communication data with a computer system via the exchange server assigned to the packet-oriented network", "and a gateway to bilaterally convert the centralized signaling and payload and the decentralized signaling and payload" (lines 8-12). Thus, claim 20 also patentably distinguish over the cited art.

For at least the reasons above, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection is overcome.

Claims 4-13, 16 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ong et al. in view of Wengrovitz et al. and further in view of Strathmeyer et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0118675).

Claims 4-13, 16 and 17 depend from claim 1 and add further features thereto. Nothing is cited or found in Strathmeyer et al. that overcomes the deficiencies of Ong et al. and Wengrovitz et al. discussed above with respect to claim 1. Thus, the arguments above with respect to claim 1 also apply to these claims.

For at least the reasons above, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection is overcome.

Claims 18 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ong et al. in view of Wengrovitz et al. and further in view of Lindberg et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,094,479).

Claims 18 and 19 depend from claim 1 and add further features thereto. Nothing is cited or found in Lindberg et al. that overcomes the deficiencies of Ong et al. and Wengrovitz et al. discussed above with respect to claim 1. Thus, the arguments above with respect to claim 1 also apply to these claims.

For at least the reasons above, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection is overcome.

Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ong et al. in view of Wengrovitz et al. and Strathmeyer et al. as applied to claim 13, and further in view of Lewis et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,947,531).

Claim 14 depends from claim 1 and adds further features thereto. Nothing is cited or found in Strathmeyer et al. or Lewis et al. that overcomes the deficiencies of Ong et al. and Wengrovitz et al. discussed above with respect to claim 1. Thus, the arguments above with respect to claim 1 also apply to claim 14.

For at least the reasons above, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection is overcome.

Summary

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 11-26-2007

By: Michael A. Leonard II
Michael A. Leonard II
Registration No. 60,180

1201 New York Avenue, N.W., 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501